

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 12 and 17 are independent claims. Claims 1-3, 6, 8, 12-15, 17 and 20 have been amended.

These modifications are fully supported by the original disclosure and do not add any new matter.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejection

Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 15, 16 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “roaming.” Claims 2 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “imaginary.” Claims 3, 4, 6, 8-16, and 18-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “role-switching.” Claims 4, 8, 14, 15, 19 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “advertisement.”

Nowhere in the claims includes “the” or “said” preceding “roaming.” Thus, it is respectfully submitted that there is no concern for antecedent basis for the limitation “roaming.”

Only claim 17 includes “the” preceding “imaginary” However, there is antecedent basis for “the imaginary” since claim 17 recites “having the CP generate an imaginary UPnP device, wherein the imaginary UPnP device is

recognizable as a UPnP device.” Nowhere in other claims includes “the” or “said” preceding “imaginary.” Thus, it is respectfully submitted that there is no concern for antecedent basis for the limitation “imaginary.”

Nowhere in the claims includes “the” or “said” preceding “role-switching.” Thus, it is respectfully submitted that there is no concern for antecedent basis for the limitation “role-switching.”

Only claim 5 includes “the” preceding “advertisement” However, there is antecedent basis for “the advertisement” since claim 4 recites “information about the CP before role-switching is transmitted through an advertisement message of the UPnP device,” and claim 5 depends from claim 4. Nowhere in other claims includes “the” or “said” preceding “advertisement.” Thus, it is respectfully submitted that there is no concern for antecedent basis for the limitation “advertisement.”

Thus, these rejections are improper and should be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §§ 102 & 103 Rejections

Claims 1-6, 8, 9 and 11-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Humpleman et al. Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humpleman et al. Claim 10 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Humpleman et al. as applied to claim 1 and in view of Van Ryzin et al. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Complete discussions of the Examiner's rejections are set forth in the Office Action, and are not being repeated here.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a method of performing a roaming function by including at least two CPs in a UPnP-based network system and has been amended to clarify that at least one of the CPs is recognizable as a UPnP device in the UPnP-based network system. Independent claim 15 is directed to a method of having the CP perform a UPnP standard roaming function by having the CP role-switched into a UPnP device form, in a UPnP-based network system including a CP, a media server and a media renderer, and has been amended to clarify that the CP is recognizable as a UPnP device in the UPnP-based home network system when role switched into the UPnP device form. Claim 17 is directed to a method of having the CP simultaneously perform a CP function and a UPnP device function by having the CP generate an imaginary UPnP device, in a UPnP-based network system including a CP, a media server and a media renderer and has been amended to clarify that the imaginary UPnP device is recognizable as a UPnP device in the UPnP-based home network system.

A CP can recognize only UPnP devices such as a media server and a media renderer in the UPnP-based network of the present application. The independent claims of the present application recite a CP recognizable as a UPnP device. However, Humpleman et al. fails to mention UPnP or Universal Plug-and-Play for a network system. Instead, Humpleman et al. describes a

conventional home network, wherein one device can send a control and command data to another device, and involves no UPnP network or UPnP devices. Van Ryzin et al. also fails to mention UPnP or Universal Plug-and-Play for a network system, and thus does not overcome the deficiencies of Humpleman et al. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the applied references, taken singularly or even when combined, fail to teach or suggest using UPnP devices in a UPnP-based network system, where at least one CP is recognizable as a UPnP device, as claimed.

Accordingly, amended independent claims 1, 15 and 17 are allowable and each claim depending therefrom is also allowable.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons and in view of the above clarifying amendments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw all of the objections and rejections of record, and to provide an early issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters which need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Jun S. Ha (Registration No. 58,508) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and further replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: October 18, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASH & BIRCH, LLP

By Esther Chong
Esther H. Chong, #40,953

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22032-0747
(703) 205-8000

EHC/JSH:ma